

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed November 19, 2003 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-55 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 17, 29, 39, 48, and 51-55 have been amended, claim 56 has been newly added and no claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-56 are pending in the application.

Applicants thank the examiner for rejoining all the claims that are pending in the application.

This amendment adds and changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

In the office action, claims 1-10, 17-41, and 48-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,422,061 (hereafter Sunshine '061). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims 1, 17, 29, 39, and 48 recite, *inter alia*, a method or system that classifies or identifies one or more substances that produce multidimensional information (for example, olfactory information) whereby a first data related to one or more substances is produced from a first node and a second data related to one or more substances is produced from a second node where the first and second node are connected by a computer network. Therefore, in addition to identifying or classifying the one or more substances, a combined analysis can be performed based on the first and second data that are received from two separate nodes.

Such a recited networked arrangement provides the advantage that data from two different sources can be identified and/or classified and analysis can be performed based on both the first and second data. For example, sensor data at a first node and a second node (for example, the nodes 105 shown in Fig. 1 of the application) can be used to identify one or more substances at these nodes and analysis can be performed based not only on the identified substances but also the nodes from which the sensor data was received. As recited in claims 51-55 such a identification/classification and analysis process can be applied to perimeter monitoring, explosive monitoring, hazardous spill monitoring, or radiation monitoring.

These recited features are not disclosed or suggested by Sunshine '061. Specifically, Sunshine '061 relates to an apparatus or method that detects sensory data and sends the information over a computer network but does not teach or suggest a combined analysis based on such data from two nodes connected over a computer network. Specifically, Sunshine '061 discloses a vapor sensing device that is small and lightweight so that it can be used as a handheld device. In Figs. 16-17 and its description in the specification, Sunshine '061 discloses that an e-nose device 100 can be connected through a computer network 18 so that processing of data from that e-nose device can be offloaded to a central processor 12 and data store 14. Therefore, as shown in Fig. 16, Sunshine '061 teaches that sensory data from the e-nose device can be transmitted over the network 18 to a remote processor 12 which interacts with the data store 14 to minimize the processing at the e-nose device. In Fig. 17, Sunshine '061 discloses another embodiment in which only a part of the processing is performed at the remote processor 12 with the analyte analyzer module 26 being retained at the e-nose device 100. In each of these embodiments, Sunshine '061 only teaches that a computer network may be used to perform some or all of the processing performed at a single e-nose device 100 at a remote location. There is no teaching or suggestion of receiving first and second data from a first and second node and performing a combined analysis based on the first and second data in addition to performing an identification and/or classification based on the first and second data.

Since neither the recited features nor its advantages are taught by the Sunshine '061, independent claims 1, 17, 29, 39, and 48 are believed to be patentable over the disclosure of Sunshine '061.

Independent claims 11 and 42 recite a system and method for preprocessing information in which voltage readings of a plurality of sensors are acquired and compared to a base line voltage of a predetermined range and some of these sensor readings are rejected if the voltage is outside the predetermined range. Sunshine '061 does not disclose or suggest any such rejection of sensor readings based on voltage readings being outside a predetermined range. The office action incorrectly cites to a voltage  $V_{ref}$  in Fig. 12A as disclosing this recited feature. As disclosed in col. 13, lines 45-55 of Sunshine '061, for example, the voltage  $V_{ref}$  refers to a predetermined voltage that is *supplied* to the voltage divider network

so that small changes in the resistance values of the chemically sensitive resistors cause detectable changes in the network output voltage. That is, voltage Vref refers to a supply voltage that is selected to ensure that the chemical resistance change of the sensors can be detected. Therefore, it is clear that Vref does not relate to the recited baseline voltage range that is used to reject a sensor that is being used to acquire sensory information. Therefore, since this recited feature is not disclosed or suggested by Sunshine '061, independent claims 11 and 42 are also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.

The dependent claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

In view of the above, applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 19, 2004

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5490

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Michael D. Kaminski  
Registration No. 32,904

Aaron C. Chatterjee  
Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicants